

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDRES GOMEZ,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
ELEGANCE PROPERTIES, LLC,  
Defendant.

Case No. 4:22-cv-00471-YGR


**ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

A federal court may decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over a state law claim “in exceptional circumstances.” 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(4). Supplemental jurisdiction “is a doctrine of discretion, not of plaintiff’s right.” *United Mine Workers of Am. v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715, 726 (1966). When a “high-frequency” litigant such as plaintiff asserts a California Unruh Act claim in federal court with an ADA claim, this typically constitutes an exceptional circumstance that justifies dismissal of the Unruh Act claim. *See Arroyo v. Rosas*, 19 F.4th 1202, 1211-14 (9th Cir. 2021); *Garcia v. Maciel*, No. 21-cv-03743-JC, 2022 WL 395316 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2022). In light of the foregoing, plaintiff is hereby **ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE** why this Court should not decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the Unruh Act claim given the infancy of this case.

Plaintiff shall file a written response to this order to show cause no later than May 26, 2022. Failure to respond in writing will result in the Unruh Act claim being dismissed with prejudice.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: May 12, 2022

  
YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE